

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action of March 13, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Please note that the undersigned is the new attorney of record pursuant to the Power of Attorney included in conjunction with the Statement Under 37 CFR 3.73(b) filed August 2, 2007. Claims 1-6, 8, 12-14, 16-18 and 20 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-9, 12-18 and 20 remain pending upon entry of the present amendment. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

#### ***Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)***

Claims 1-5 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,546,405, “Gupta”) in view of Boreczky *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,296, “Boreczky”). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “using the plurality of pointers to automatically present only the plurality of desired portions of the multimedia presentation without presenting any other portion of the multimedia presentation including the third portion, wherein the second desired portion is displayed automatically after the first desired portion without user interaction.” Nowhere does Gupta or Boreczky, either separately or in combination, teach or suggest such features. Gupta is generally related to annotating temporally-dimensioned multimedia content. Abstract. In particular, Gupta discloses a user being able to use temporal annotations to control playback of the multimedia document. Col. 2, ll. 52-53. Gupta further discloses that a user can select a temporal annotation from a list to jump to within the playback of a multimedia document. Col. 2, ll. 54-58. Nonetheless, Gupta does not teach or suggest that a second desired portion is displayed automatically after a first desired portion *without user interaction*. In contrast, Gupta teaches that a user must manually select each point in a multimedia presentation to which she wishes to skip or jump. That is, Gupta lacks a teaching or suggestion of displaying a second particular relative time associated with a temporal annotation automatically after a first particular relative time associated with a temporal annotation *without user interaction*. In Gupta’s system, a user would have to manually select the first annotation to jump to the first time and subsequently manually select a second annotation to jump to the second time. Col. 2, ll. 52-58. As such, Gupta requires user interaction with the system between

the first jump and the second jump in contrast to the features recited in claim 1. Boreczky fails to cure these deficiencies of Gupta. Thus, notwithstanding whether the combination of Gupta and Boreczky is valid, the asserted combination does not result in the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is thus allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 2-5 are dependent on claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claim 13 recites features similar to those recited in claim 1 and is thus allowable for substantially the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the other novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claims 14-17 are dependent on claim 13 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 13 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claims 6-9, 12, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of Kelly *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,907,322) and Boreczky.

Amended independent claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, “transmitting, from the location remote from said first location, to a viewing system the annotation file as a transmission that is distinct from the broadcast of the event, the annotation file configured to automatically display only the plurality of desired portions of the event without displaying the annotations and without displaying any other portion of the event, the second desired portion being automatically displayed after the first desired portion without user interaction.” As discussed previously with respect to claim 1, Gupta is directed to an annotation system that requires a user to manually select annotations to jump to various points in a multimedia document. Nowhere does Gupta teach or suggest displaying a second portion of a multimedia presentation automatically after a first desired portion *without user interaction*. Neither Boreczky nor Kelly, either separately or in combination, cures this deficiency of Gupta. Thus, notwithstanding whether the asserted combination is valid, the asserted combination would not have resulted in the features recited in claim 6. Accordingly, claim 6 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Additionally, none of the cited references teach or suggest transmitting, from the location remote from said first location, to a viewing system an annotation file. As the Office Action notes, Kelly merely discloses transmitting an activity table *to* an on-line database (i.e., the

alleged location remote from the first location). In contrast, claim 6 recites transmitting an annotation file *from* the location remote from said first location. Gupta and Borezcky are similarly deficient and thus, fail to cure the deficiencies of Gupta. Claim 6 is thus allowable for this additional reason.

Claim 7 is dependent on claim 6 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 6 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Amended independent claims 8 recites, *inter alia*, “automatic display of only the first and second desired portions of the multimedia presentation without displaying the annotations, the second desired portion being automatically displayed after the first desired portion without user interaction.” As discussed with respect to claim 6, Gupta is merely directed to manual selection of annotation points in a multimedia document. Nowhere does Gupta or any of the cited secondary references, either separately or in combination, teach or suggest automatically displaying a second portion after a first portion without user interaction. Claim 8 is thus allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 9 and 12 are dependent on claim 8 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 8 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Amended independent 18 recites features similar to the above-recited features of claim 8 and is thus allowable for substantially the same reasons as claim 8. Claim 20, which depends on claim 18, is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 18 by virtue of its dependency and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

|

**CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner find that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite passage to issue of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below. If any additional fees are required or if an overpayment has been made the Commissioner is authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 19-0733. Applicants look forward to passage to issue of the present application at the earliest convenience of the Office.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: September 12, 2007

By:           /Chunhsi Andy Mu/          

Chunhsi Andy Mu  
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051  
Tel:(202) 824-3000  
Fax:(202) 824-3001